

Ms. Kamini Shah
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Mr. Thai Phan
Patent Examiner

Dear Ms. Shah:

With regard to Mr. Phan's merging of claims 7 into claims 1, 10 and 15, please note the following:

The database may consist of a single record which is common to all Unique Identifiers and would be in that case degenerate and therefore optional. The timestamp may be set to a time so far in the future as to make it irrelevant, and therefore optional. The simulation count may be set to a count so large as to make the count irrelevant, and therefore optional. It is also a known art with respect to elements such as HTML "cookies" to set a cookie expiration time which could be used to place an additional time limit on the Unique Identifier, irrespective of the other limits.

May I ask if we may still consider additional, narrower independent claims based on the claims as presented in the appeal brief of 2/19/2008, plus material from other dependent claims and/or from the specification?

For example, Claim 1/10/15 combined with Claim 9 is, of course, non-obvious in my view, but because it would add an additional level of circuit synthesis I don't believe you should find any of the language of Claim 7 necessary.

Similarly, Claim 1/10/15 plus Claim 14, and optional reference to Claim 12 where the Unique Identifier is described as "persistent and part of a login or user-qualification process" without reference to the language of Claim 7.

I am reviewing the claims for other such synergy and believe that if additional Claims cannot be added now, then I have a good reason to file a divisional/continuance. Your opinion/suggestion here would be much appreciated.

Thank you very much,
Chris Rode
Applicant, PRO-SE, 09/287,478
781-899-4322